



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/654,745	09/01/2000	David M. Orlicki	79594PRC	7150
1333	7590	06/16/2006	EXAMINER	
JERABEK, KELLY L				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2622		

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/654,745	ORLICKI ET AL.
	Examiner Kelly L. Jerabek	Art Unit 2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-7 and 12-24 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 8-11 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 7, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tanaka et al. US 6,597,389.

Re claim 1, Tanaka discloses an apparatus comprising: a basic device (18) including a docking interface (142) (figure 3); and an accessory device (14,16) including a control processor and a power supply unit, that couples to the docking interface (142) of the basic device (18); wherein the power supply unit supplies electrical energy to the

control processor in response to a control signal received from the basic device (18) (14 powers on the camera 16 when an instruction is received) (col. 4, line 9-col. 6, line 14); wherein the control signal provides an indication from the basic device (18) to the accessory device (14,16) that the accessory device (14,16) is to be powered on using a power source internal to the accessory device (14,16); wherein the control signal triggers a transition of the accessory device (14,16) from a powered-off state in which the power supply unit is deactivated and the control processor is powered off to a powered-on state in which the power supply unit is activated and the control processor is powered on, the control signal being indicative of whether or not an application which requires use of the accessory device (14,16) is currently running on the basic device (18) (whether or not a remote camera (16) is to be viewed/controlled using terminal (18) (col. 8, line 59-col. 9, line 23; figures 1-3 and 10).

Re claim 2, Tanaka states that the power supply unit maintains the electrical energy supplied to the control processor in response to a further control signal (override turnoff if image from camera (16) is being transmitted to a reception terminal station (18) different from the camera control client) received from the control processor (col. 11, line 55-col. 13, line 4).

Re claim 3, Tanaka states that the power supply unit includes a power management circuit that receives the control signal from the basic device (18) and the

further control signal from the control processor, and a power supply that supplies the electrical energy to the control processor (col. 8, line 59-col. 9, line 23).

Re claim 7, Tanaka states that a monitoring terminal station (18) is capable of remotely controlling ON/OFF of a power supply of an arbitrary camera (16) in order to reduce power consumption (col. 8, line 59-col. 9, line 23). Therefore, since a remote user may control the power supply of a variety of cameras the Examiner is reading the structure disclosed by Tanaka as a switched mode power supply.

Re claim 21, Tanaka discloses a method of managing the power requirements of an accessory device (14,16) coupled to a basic device (18) comprising: generating a first control signal with the basic device (18) and supplying the first control signal to the accessory device (14,16) (col. 4, line 9-col. 6, line 14); the first control signal providing an indication from the basic device (18) to the accessory device (14,16) that the accessory device (14,16) is to be powered on using a power source internal to the accessory device (14,16); activating a power supply unit of the accessory device (14,16) in response to the first control signal to supply electrical power from the power supply unit to a control processor of the accessory device (14,16) (col. 8, line 59-col. 9, line 23; figures 1-3 and 10); generating a second control signal (override shut-off if image from camera (16) is being transmitted to another terminal station (18) with the control processor of the accessory device and supplying the second control signal to the power supply unit; and latching operation of the power supply unit in response to the second

control signal to maintain the supply of electrical power from the power supply unit to the control processor regardless of the state of the first control signal (col. 11, line 55-col. 13, line 4); wherein the first control signal triggers a transition of the accessory device (14,16) from a powered-off state in which the power supply unit is deactivated and the control processor is powered off to a powered-on state in which the power supply unit is activated and the control processor is powered on, the control signal being indicative of whether or not an application which requires use of the accessory device (14,16) is currently running on the basic device (18) (whether or not a remote camera (16) is to be viewed/controlled using terminal (18) (col. 8, line 59-col. 9, line 23; figures 1-3 and 10).

Re claims 22-23, Tanaka also states that latching of the operation of the power supply unit is maintained for a predetermined period of time and latching is discontinued after expiration of the predetermined time period in response to a first control signal (col. 13, lines 17-34).

Re claim 24, Tanaka further states that an operation (send video to display requesting video) is performed with the accessory device (16) in response to an activity command signal (terminal 18 requests video signal) and resetting the predetermined time period after completion of the accessory operation (check for a predetermined period of time when images displayed on all the video display areas are cleared) (col. 13, lines 17-34).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 13-16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al.

Re claim 4, Tanaka discloses all of the limitations of claim 3 above. Specifically, Tanaka states that power is supplied to a camera (16) in response to a control signal received from a remote terminal device (18). However, Tanaka fails to specifically disclose a first switching element to generate a power activation signal and a second switching element responsive to the power activation signal. The Examiner takes **Official Notice** that it is well known in the art to use switching elements in digital circuits in order to read signals input from external devices and allow the electronic devices to operate. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to include a first switching element responsive to the external control signal to generate a power activation signal and a second switching element that is responsive

the power activation signal. Doing so would provide a means for allowing a remote terminal to input a control signal into the electronic circuitry of a camera in order to remotely power and control the camera.

Re claim 13, Tanaka discloses a digital camera accessory device (16) comprising: a basic device (18) including a docking interface (142) (figure 3); and an accessory device (14,16) including a control processor and a power supply unit, that couples to the docking interface (142) of the basic device (18); wherein the power supply unit supplies electrical energy to the control processor in response to a control signal received from the basic device (18) (14 powers on the camera 16 when an instruction is received) (col. 4, line 9-col. 6, line 14); wherein the control signal provides an indication from the basic device (18) to the accessory device (14,16) that the accessory device (14,16) is to be powered on using a power source internal to the accessory device (14,16); wherein the control signal triggers a transition of the accessory device (14,16) from a powered-off state in which the power supply unit is deactivated and the control processor is powered off to a powered-on state in which the power supply unit is activated and the control processor is powered on (col. 8, line 59-col. 9, line 23; figures 1-3 and 10). Although Tanaka discloses all of the limitations above it fails to disclose the details of the video cameras such as the lens system and the image processing circuitry. The Examiner takes **Official Notice** that it is well known in the art for video cameras to include lens systems and image processing circuitry that captures image data. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to

include a lens and image processing circuitry in the video cameras disclosed by Tanaka in order to capture video images with high quality.

Re claim 14, Tanaka states that the power supply unit maintains the electrical energy supplied to the control processor in response to a further control signal (override turnoff if image from camera (16) is being transmitted to a reception terminal station (18) different from the camera control client) received from the control processor (col. 11, line 55-col. 13, line 4).

Re claim 15, Tanaka states that the power supply unit includes a power management circuit that receives the control signal from the basic device (18) and the further control signal from the control processor, and a power supply that supplies the electrical energy to the control processor (col. 8, line 59-col. 9, line 23).

Re claim 16, Tanaka discloses all of the limitations of claim 15 above. Specifically, Tanaka states that power is supplied to a camera (16) in response to a control signal received from a remote terminal device (18). However, Tanaka fails to specifically disclose a first switching element to generate a power activation signal and a second switching element responsive to the power activation signal. The Examiner takes **Official Notice** that it is well known in the art to use switching elements in digital circuits in order to read signals input from external devices and allow the electronic devices to operate. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to

have been motivated to include a first switching element responsive to the external control signal to generate a power activation signal and a second switching element that is responsive to the power activation signal. Doing so would provide a means for allowing a remote terminal to input a control signal into the electronic circuitry of a camera in order to remotely power and control the camera.

Re claim 19, Tanaka states that a monitoring terminal station (18) is capable of remotely controlling ON/OFF of a power supply of an arbitrary camera (16) in order to reduce power consumption (col. 8, line 59-col. 9, line 23). Therefore, since a remote user may control the power supply of a variety of cameras the Examiner is reading the structure disclosed by Tanaka as a switched mode power supply.

Claims 6, 12, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. in view of applicant's admitted prior art.

Re claim 6, Tanaka discloses all of the limitations of claim 4 above. However, Takahashi fails to disclose a bipolar transistor and a field effect transistor uses as switching elements.

The use of bi-polar transistors and field effect transistors is now taken to be admitted prior art because Applicant failed to traverse the Examiner's assertion of Official Notice in reply to the Office Action mailed in which a common knowledge statement was made. See MPEP §2144.03. Therefore, it would have been obvious for

one skilled in the art to have been motivated to use bipolar transistors and field effect transistors as switching element sin the digital camera disclosed by Tanaka Doing so would provide a means for allowing a remote terminal to input a control signal into the electronic circuitry of a camera in order to remotely power and control the camera.

Re claim 12, Tanaka discloses all of the limitations of claim 1 above and also discloses that the power supply maintains the electrical energy when the control signal fluctuates (col. 11, line 55-col. 13, line 4). Despite this, Tanaka does not specifically state that the switching unit includes a capacitor and resistor network comprising at least one capacitor and one resistor.

The use of a capacitor and resistor network is now taken to be admitted prior art because Applicant failed to traverse the Examiner's assertion of Official Notice in reply to the Office Action mailed in which a common knowledge statement was made. See MPEP §2144.03. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to include a capacitor and resistor network for latching the swiching control unit disclosed by Tanaka. Doing so would provide a means for allowing a remote terminal to input a control signal into the electronic circuitry of a camera in order to remotely power and maintain power to the camera.

Re claim 18, Tanaka discloses all of the limitations of claim 16 above. However, Takahashi fails to disclose a bipolar transistor and a field effect transistor uses as switching elements.

The use of bi-polar transistors and field effect transistors is now taken to be admitted prior art because Applicant failed to traverse the Examiner's assertion of Official Notice in reply to the Office Action mailed in which a common knowledge statement was made. See MPEP §2144.03. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to use bipolar transistors and field effect transistors as switching element sin the digital camera disclosed by Tanaka Doing so would provide a means for allowing a remote terminal to input a control signal into the electronic circuitry of a camera in order to remotely power and control the camera.

Re claim 20, Tanaka discloses all of the limitations of claim 13 above and also discloses that the power supply maintains the electrical energy when the control signal fluctuates (col. 11, line 55-col. 13, line 4). Despite this, Tanaka does not specifically state that the switching unit includes a capacitor and resistor network comprising at least one capacitor and one resistor.

The use of a capacitor and resistor network is now taken to be admitted prior art because Applicant failed to traverse the Examiner's assertion of Official Notice in reply to the Office Action mailed in which a common knowledge statement was made. See MPEP §2144.03. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to include a capacitor and resistor network for latching the swiching control unit disclosed by Tanaka. Doing so would provide a means for allowing a remote terminal to input a control signal into the electronic circuitry of a camera in order to remotely power and maintain power to the camera.

Claims 5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. in view of Elberbaum US 6,191,814.

Re claim 5, Tanaka discloses all of the limitations of claim 4 above. However, Tanaka fails to specifically state that the accessory device (14,16) includes a battery.

Elberbaum discloses that a current supply (26) is connected to a TV camera (18) and a battery (10) installed inside the camera housing is capable of being recharged by the current supply (26) (col. 7, lines 24-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to include a rechargeable battery as disclosed by Elberbaum in the video cameras disclosed by Tanaka. Doing so would provide a means for enabling the power source of a video camera to be recharged by an external source.

Re claim 17, Tanaka discloses all of the limitations of claim 16 above. However, Tanaka fails to specifically state that the accessory device (14,16) includes a battery.

Elberbaum discloses that a current supply (26) is connected to a TV camera (18) and a battery (10) installed inside the camera housing is capable of being recharged by the current supply (26) (col. 7, lines 24-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to have been motivated to include a rechargeable battery as disclosed by Elberbaum in the video cameras disclosed by Tanaka. Doing so would

provide a means for enabling the power source of a video camera to be recharged by an external source.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 8-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Re claims 8-11, the prior art fails to teach or suggest, "An apparatus comprising: a basic device including a docking interface; and an accessory device, including a control processor and a power supply unit, that couples to the docking interface of the basic device; wherein the power supply unit supplies electrical energy to the control processor in response to a control signal received from the basic device; **wherein the control signal provides an indication from the basic device to the accessory device that the accessory device is to be powered on using a power source internal to the accessory device**; wherein the control signal triggers a transition of the accessory device from a powered-off state in which the power supply unit is deactivated and the control processor is powered off to a powered-on state in which the power

supply unit is activated and the control processor is powered on, the control signal being indicative of whether or not an application which requires use of the accessory device is currently running on the basic device, **wherein the basic device comprises a personal digital assistant device".**

Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kelly L. Jerabek whose telephone number is (571) 272-7312. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 AM - 5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for submitting all Official communications is (703) 872-9306. The fax phone number for submitting informal communications such as drafts, proposed amendments, etc., may be faxed directly to the Examiner at (571) 273-7312.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KLJ



DAVID OMETZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER